

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/804,756	EESLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nihir Patel	3743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Nihir Patel. (3) _____
 (2) David Laprairie. (4) _____

Date of Interview: February 18, 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: porous heat sink appl-no. 2001KR-0002494.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued that the reference did not meet the required date. The examiner agrees. The previous office action (november 4th, 2002) will be withdrawn and the application is not abandoned. A further search and a new office action will be sent..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required